IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY

CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO.235 OF 2005

Vinayak Keshav Manjrekar ...Applicant

Versus

Shri Minoo Rustom Hiramanek & Anr. ...Respondents

.....

Mr.P.B.Patil for Applicant.

Ms.S.V.Gajare, A.P.P. for Respondent No.2.

.....

CORAM: A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.

NOVEMBER 30, 2005.

P.C.

1. Heard Counsel for the parties.

2. In the first place, revision is not maintainable as it is directed against interlocutory order. In any case, there is no infirmity in the view taken by the Court below in rejecting the application presented by the Applicant seeking permission to add Mr.Mehernosh Manek Choksi as Respondent No.3 in the pending

appeal. The order passed by the Trial Court in dropping that party from the array of accused was allowed to become final. This application is, therefore, devoid of merits.

3. Insofar as the grievance of the Applicant that the Respondent/complainant should disclose as to what amount had been received from original accused No.3 Mr.M.M.Choksi is concerned, that request can be made before the Appellate Court, which will consider the same in accordance with law.

4. Application disposed of on the above terms.

A.M.KHANWILKAR, J.